

## **Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2007**

**Members Present:** Alice Keller, Jackson Bebbler, Amanda Starcher, Jay Winer, Marsha Shortell, Todd Williams, Suzanne Jones, John Cram, Diane Duermit, Rob Moody, Lupe Perez, Scott Riviere

**Members Absent:** Cheryl McMurry, Alice Coppedge

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Curt Euler, Wendy Simmons, Jennifer Blevins

**Public:** Scott Mitchell, Gregg & Kelly Homolka, Hunter Kalman, Nikki Mitchell, Bryan Moffitt, Todd Fowler, Marilyn Avery, Kent Scherr, Carroll Hughes, Chris Ortwein, Michael Robinson, Tim Fierle, Susan West

**Call to Order:** Chair Winer called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. with a quorum present.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Jones made a motion to adopt the May, 2007 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Shortell  
Vote for: All

Commissioner Shortell made a motion to adopt the April, 2007 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Jones  
Vote for: All

### **Public Hearings:**

#### **Agenda Item**

**Owner/Applicant:** Historic Biltmore Village, LLC/Hill Partners  
**Subject Property:** 2 Swan Street  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** 9647.07-69-9908  
**Zoning District:** CB-2  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted the changes to the site plan including a street tree, dumpster screening, landscaping, brick sidewalk, outdoor furniture and street lighting. She confirmed that the changes made satisfied her earlier concerns.
-----------------------	---

<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Bryan Moffitt, project architect, passed out copies of the material palette and outdoor furniture specifications. He stated that once a tenant is placed, they would submit an application for signage and outdoor lighting and noted that they may also change or eliminate the outdoor furniture. He explained the brick restoration process and said it would resemble the Hanson brand "Old Richmond" color. He also pointed out the changes that were made to give the façade a more balanced look and said that the ramp shown on the perspective drawing has been eliminated.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

**Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Starcher asked for clarification on the side door. She suggested that the door should have more detail because it faces a main street. After discussion, it was decided that more detail would call attention to it and that a painted hollow metal door would be appropriate for a service entrance, but that if a tenant needed the door as a secondary entrance, they would come back to the Commission with a new design for review.

**Commission Action**

**MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – proposed north and east elevations dated 2/16/07; Exhibit B – new construction checklist; Exhibit C – scope of work summary; Exhibit D – area survey; Exhibit E – site plan; Exhibit F – floor plan; Exhibit G – 4 elevations; Exhibit H – context photographs; Exhibit I – exterior perspective; Exhibit J – revised site plan; Exhibit K – material photographs; Exhibit L – outdoor furniture specifications and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within the Biltmore Village Historic District and all others within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits M and N.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to renovate existing 1,549 sq. ft. brick structure per attached plans. Replace roof shingles. Shingles will be GAF Slateline Victorian Red. Replace storefront with new storefront windows and doors. Storefront will be anodized aluminum. Add gable structure with pebbledash stucco and half-timbering over front entrance. Trim will be MiraTec composite lumber painted Appalachian Brown SW 2115-10. Brick will be restored to match old Richmond

by Hanson Brick. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the Guidelines for Rehabilitation Existing Auto-Oriented Commercial Buildings, found in Book 2, Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings in Biltmore Village, Chapter 5 Pages 21-22 and the Guidelines for Site Design found in Book 1, Chapter 5, pages 23-26 of the *Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines* were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The roof forms and materials will allow the structure to blend better with the historic buildings in the district.
2. The site improvements will also help to blend the structure with the district.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Shortell

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** City of Asheville  
**Subject Property:** All Souls Crescent & Swan Street  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** N/A  
**Zoning District:** ROW  
**Other Permits:** N/A

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She explained that she had met with Mr. Grant, Assistant Director of Public Works, in Biltmore Village to get a general idea about the location of the lights and the number to order. She said that Mr. Grant had later met with a former HRC member and merchant in Biltmore Village to locate the new fixtures, but that a plan had not been submitted to the HRC for review. Consequently, some of the locations were not appropriate. She displayed a lighting plan showing the current placement and noting which lights she recommends moving. She stated that they cannot all align exactly with the existing lights because of drive openings
-----------------------	--

	and noted that the light on the corner of All Souls Crescent would interfere with the handicap access to the sidewalk if it were exactly aligned with the existing lights. She also indicated the recommended locations for the meter bases.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Wendy Simmons, representing Mr. Grant, stated that the general practice is to stagger street lights to avoid pools of darkness. She also noted that the cost to move those already placed would be exorbitant. She stated that she was available to answer any questions, but was not authorized to make changes to the plan.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
Susan West	She stated that the Development Plan calls for evenly placed lights and displayed a map showing the placement she thinks would be appropriate.

#### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Shortell stated that the Commission is concerned with how uniformly placed the light poles look in the daylight, not just how evenly they light the sidewalks at night. Several Commissioners stated that the poles should be more evenly spaced to follow the Development Plan. They also agreed that the meter bases should be placed as discretely as possible. They discussed continuing the hearing for one month so that Mr. Grant could be present to make a decision about amending the application or proceeding forward without changes. At Mr. Euler's suggestion, the Commission asked Ms. Simmons to call Mr. Grant and let him know that they would not be able to approve the plan as submitted. They proceeded to another hearing to allow her time to try to reach him.

When the hearing resumed, Ms. Simmons stated that Mr. Grant agreed to make the changes proposed on Ms. Merten's drawing, assuming the funding was available to him.

#### **Commission Action**

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – memo from Richard Grant, Assistant Director of Public Works; Exhibit B – meter base schematic; Exhibit C – lighting location plan; Exhibit D – aerial photograph; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within the Biltmore Village Historic District were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. Application is to install Biltmore Village street lights and meter bases per attached sketch plan. Retrofit existing fixtures with 250 watt metal halide. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the *Biltmore Village Development Plan* for Pedestrian and Utility improvements found on page 60 was used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The light spacing meets the Development Plan as closely as possible, taking current conditions into consideration.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: Chair Winer and Commissioners Keller, Starcher, Shortell, Williams, Jones, Duermit, Riviere and Perez

Vote against: Commissioners Bebbber, Moody and Cram

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: Chair Winer and Commissioners Keller, Starcher, Shortell, Williams, Jones, Duermit, Riviere and Perez

Vote against: Commissioners Bebbber, Moody and Cram

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Nicole Mitchell  
**Subject Property:** 74 Magnolia Street  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.13-13-5124  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She pointed out the dying Norway maple tree that will be removed and a sycamore tree that will be pruned. She requested window and door specifications and noted that landscaping is required along the driveway.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant</b>	Nicole Mitchell, the applicant, agreed that she would submit the additional information.

Representative(s)	
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
By letter	Ms. Merten told the Commissioners that she received a letter from a neighbor with concerns about possible overpruning of the sycamore tree. She recommended that a certified arborist oversee the tree pruning.

**Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Shortell suggested that the requirement for an arborist be made a condition of the Certificate of Appropriateness and others agreed.

**Commission Action**

**MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 3/20/07, including project description, 4 elevations, floor plans, site plan and aerial photograph; Exhibit B – application package dated 4/24/07, including new construction checklist, site plan and notes, exterior color/finish schedule, streetscape, 4 elevations, and floor plans; Exhibit C – application package dated 5/29/07, including summary of revisions, site plan and notes; 4 elevations; floor plans, 4 garage elevations and garage floor plans; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits D and E.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct new 1 ½ -story single-family residence with wrap around front porch and detached garage per attached plans. Structure will have smooth stucco foundation with stone piers and stone veneer on front. Siding will be horizontal hardi-plank. Roof will be composition asphalt shingle, slate blend. Details include decorative moldings, corner boards, box cornices and window and door surrounds. Porch will be concrete with concrete steps and T/G ceiling. Windows will be wood, SDL, double-hung, 2 over 1. Doors will be wood half light on front and right side. Garage will have horizontal hardi-plank siding, detailing and window specifications to match house. Flexible development approved to allow garage to be set back three feet from the rear and west side property lines. Dying Norway maple in front yard will be removed. Driveway will be concrete. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Residential Structures found on pages 56-58, Carriage Houses, Garages and Outbuildings found on pages 52-53, Vegetation found on page 50, Fences found on pages 42-43 and Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 44-45 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The house will be compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood in terms of material scale, texture and color.
2. The reduced rear setback will allow the house and garage to be more in line with the historic pattern.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Shortell

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

1. **A certified arborist will oversee the pruning of the sycamore tree.**
2. **The applicant will submit a plan for landscaping along the driveway to staff for review.**
3. **The applicant will submit window and door specifications to staff for review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Cram

Vote for: All

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Todd Fowler  
**Subject Property:** Harrison Street  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.17-21-4617  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property, reviewed the staff report and noted the changes made since the preliminary review. She pointed out that edging is required for gravel driveways and landscaping is also required along driveways.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Todd Fowler, the applicant, said that he would use brick edging for the drive and agreed that he would submit a landscape plan.

Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
No discussion	

**Commission Action**

**MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 4/17/07, including flexible development application, new construction checklist, aerial photograph, 4 elevations, floor plans, site plan, photographs and storyboard; Exhibit B – final application package dated 5/22/07, including new construction checklist, 4 elevations, floor plans, site plan and landscape plan; Exhibit C – window and door specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits D and E.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct a new 1 ½ story single-family structure per attached plans. The structure will have a concrete block foundation with smooth stucco finish, hardi-plank horizontal lapped siding with shingles above and craftsman detailing. Roof will be grey asphalt shingles. Windows will be wood, SDL, double hung and casement. Doors will be wood ½ light. Apply flexible development for structure to be set back 12’ 8” in the front in a similar fashion to the neighboring structures. Construct new gravel driveway on north side of property. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Residential Structures found on pages 56-58, Vegetation found on page 50, and Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 44-45 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The house will be compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood in terms of material, scale, texture and color.



2. The reduced front setback will allow the structure to be in keeping with the historic pattern.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Starcher

Second by: Commissioner Cram

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

**1. The applicant will submit a landscape plan showing plantings and brick edging along the driveway.**

Motion by: Commissioner Starcher

Second by: Commissioner Shortell

Vote for: All

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Gregg Homolka  
**Subject Property:** Elizabeth Place  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.14-22-6687  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that the applications for this house and the house on Woodlawn Avenue should be considered separately since the two houses are proposed for two parcels. She noted that the house has been moved back on the lot to address the Commissioners concerns from the preliminary review.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Gregg Homolka, the applicant, passed around copies of a revised front elevation showing the brackets and flared shingles on the corners as well as some photographs of brackets and window and door specifications. He stated that the front door shown in the preliminary application is the one he's selected.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

#### Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Williams asked if the colors had been selected and Mr. Homolka replied no. After some discussion, the Commissioners agreed that the applicant could submit the colors to staff for review, but that they should be different for each house. There was discussion about whether there should be other differences in the design of the houses. Commissioner Williams noted an example on Waneta Street of identical cottages that can both be seen at the same time. It was agreed that the two proposed houses could be exactly the same except for color since they will never be seen at the same time.

#### Commission Action

#### MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 4/17/07, including new construction checklist, 4 elevations; floor plans, photographs, site plan, height diagram, fence drawing, storyboard, exterior material specifications and samples, lighting, hardware and door specifications; Exhibit B – final application package dated 5/24/07, including new construction checklist, photographs, 4 elevations, floor plans, aerial photograph, site plan, height diagram, fence drawing, hardware, lighting and door specifications, landscape plan and storyboard; Exhibit C – bracket photographs Exhibit D – revised front elevation; Exhibit E – window specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Cram;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct a new 2–story single-family structure per attached plans. Structure will have a sand finished stucco foundation, with wood shingles over smooth hardi-plank horizontal siding. Details include frieze, corner boards, brackets and flared shake corners. Roof will be of asphalt shingle in hip style with 24” overhang and exposed rafter ends. Windows will be wood casement, SDL. Door will be wood, 6 light. All existing rock walls to remain. Six ft. high post and stake privacy fence to be installed along rear property line, per site plan. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Residential Structures found on pages 56-58 and Fences found on pages 42-43 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The proposed new structure is compatible with the Montford Historic District in terms of scale, texture and materials.

- |  |
|--|
| 2. The structure will be sited in a location that will be compatible with the adjacent houses in the neighborhood. |
|--|

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness <b>are</b> compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.
---

Motion by: Commissioner Jones Second by: Commissioner Duermit Vote for: All
---

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be <b>issued with the following conditions:</b>
---

- |   |
|---|
| <b>1. The applicant will submit the paint colors to staff for review.</b> |
|---|

Motion by: Commissioner Jones Second by: Commissioner Duermit Vote for: All
---

#### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Gregg Homolka
<b>Subject Property:</b>	Woodlawn Ave.
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	June 13, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.14-22-6687
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RS-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted that not only should the colors of the two houses be different, but that on each house the wood shingles and horizontal siding should differ in color as well, with a darker color on the shingles. She pointed out that the driveway for both houses would be on this site.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	No presentation
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

#### Commission Comments/Discussion

The Commissioners asked Ms. Merten and Mr. Euler if discussion was required and they replied no.
--

#### Commission Action

## MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 4/17/07, including new construction checklist, 4 elevations; floor plans, photographs, site plan, height diagram, fence drawing, storyboard, exterior material specifications and samples, lighting, hardware and door specifications; Exhibit B – final application package dated 5/24/07, including new construction checklist, photographs, 4 elevations, floor plans, aerial photograph, site plan, height diagram, fence drawing, hardware, lighting and door specifications, landscape plan and storyboard; Exhibit C – bracket photographs; Exhibit D – window specifications; Exhibit E – revised front elevation; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Cram;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. Application is to construct new 2–story single-family structure per attached plans. Structure will have a sand finished stucco foundation, with wood shingles over smooth hardi-plank horizontal siding. Details include frieze, corner boards, brackets and flared shake corners. Roof will be of asphalt shingle in hip style with 24” overhang and exposed rafter ends. Windows will be wood casement, SDL. Door will be wood, 6-light. All existing rock walls to remain. Six ft. high post and stake privacy fence to be installed along rear property line, per site plan. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Residential Structures found on pages 56-58 and Fences found on pages 42-43 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The proposed new structure is compatible with the Montford Historic District in terms of scale, texture and materials.
2. The structure will be sited in a location that will be compatible with the adjacent houses in the neighborhood.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Perez  
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

**1. Applicant will submit colors to staff for review and colors will be different from those for the house on Elizabeth Place.**

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Williams  
Vote for: All

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Paige Hansen  
**Subject Property:** 19 Rosewood Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9639.16-93-2428  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted her concern that the proposed addition is very conspicuous and not compatible with the existing house. She suggested that if there were a window instead of a door on the front of the addition, it might look less conspicuous instead of appearing as a second main entrance.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Carroll Hughes, project architect, explained that the homeowner wants to have a way to bring groceries into the kitchen without going through the rest of the house. He passed around some photographs and copies of a revised front elevation and floor plan showing the stairs parallel to the house instead of perpendicular to address Ms. Merten's concern. He confirmed that a handrail would be required and that it would be placed against the house. He displayed window specifications and explained that the window would be 3-light over one instead of the one over one shown.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

#### Commission Comments/Discussion

The Commissioners agreed that the addition would be less conspicuous with the parallel side access steps, but several were still concerned about the addition of a second entrance on the front of the house. It was suggested that the door could be moved to the side of the addition. Ms. Merten confirmed that the HRC could apply flexible development to allow for the steps to encroach into the required setback if the entrance was moved to a less conspicuous area. There

was a lengthy discussion about possible damage to the mature oak tree. Ms. Merten suggested that the addition could be built using pier construction instead of a continuous foundation to minimize damage to the root system. Mr. Hughes agreed to the changes and said he would submit revised drawings to staff for review.

### Commission Action

Commissioner Bebbber made the following motion:

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – site plan; Exhibit B – demolition plan; Exhibit C – existing elevations; Exhibit D – partial floor plan; Exhibit E – proposed elevations; Exhibit F – 8 photographs; Exhibit G – front elevation and perspectives; Exhibit H – photographs; Exhibit I – revised elevation; Exhibit J – window specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits K and L.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to remove existing utility room on north side and replace with a new 11’ 8” x 10’ 5/8” addition. Move rear French door and add windows to rear elevation. All detailing and finishes to match existing. Windows will be wood to match existing. New side door will be half-light. Flexible development approved for 2.5’ setback on north side.  
**All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Additions found on page 55, in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The addition is located relatively inconspicuously and is compatible in character with the original structure.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Bebbber

Second by: Commissioner Duermit  
Vote for: Commissioners Bebbber, Duermit, Keller, Starcher, Shortell, Williams, Jones, Perez, Riviere and Chair Winer  
Vote against: Commissioners Cram and Moody

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

There was further discussion about conditions for revised drawings and protection of the tree. Commissioner Starcher said there were too many changes for the revised drawings to be approved by staff. Mr. Hughes asked for a straw vote. Eleven of the Commissioners present said they would need to see revised drawings and recommendations from a certified arborist for measures to be taken to protect the health of the tree. Mr. Hughes requested a continuance until the July meeting. Commissioner Bebbber retracted his motion and made a motion to continue the hearing until the July 11, 2007 meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Williams  
Vote for: All

Commissioners Moody and Bebbber left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

#### **Agenda Item**

**Owner/Applicant:** Brownie Newman/David Hill  
**Subject Property:** 285 Montford Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.13-03-2947  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten reviewed the staff report and explained the changes proposed to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Marilyn Avery, representing David Hill, reviewed the photographs showing some atypical window placements that he submitted with his application. She asked the Commissioners to be very specific about what they wanted to see if they were not prepared to approve the changes as proposed.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

#### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Starcher said that that proposed changes look very much like the drawings originally submitted for preliminary review of the project. She pointed out that they were changed for the final review to show more rhythm at the Commission's specific request. Commissioner Riviere said the window placement should be somewhat symmetrical and read with some rhythm. He said he felt the Commission had made that very clear to the applicant at previous meetings. Several other Commissioners agreed that the proposed window placement on

the south elevation appeared very scattered. They agreed that the rear elevation changes could be approved as proposed.

The Commissioners discussed the examples of stairwell windows provided. They agreed that the stepping of three windows would help to balance the fenestration and that if shorter windows are needed to accommodate the laundry counter, they should just align with the tops of the other windows to create a more symmetrical appearance. Ms. Merten asked if they would need to see revised drawings and they said yes.

#### **Commission Action**

Commissioner Shortell made a motion to continue the hearing until the July 11, 2007 meeting.  
Second by: Commissioner Cram  
Vote for: All

Commissioner Starcher left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

#### **Agenda Item**

**Owner/Applicant :** Kent & Kris Sherr  
**Subject Property:** 291 Montford Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 13, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.13-04-1163  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She stated that the project was presented as a major work because the shed would be visible from Montford Avenue. She said that it will be placed behind the footprint of the house, but not hidden behind it. She also noted that the shed will be screened by the garden as it grows.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Kent Scherr, the applicant, asked if they shed could be placed diagonally and was advised this would not be appropriate.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

#### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

The Commissioners said it would be more appropriate to turn it so that the window faces the street and Mr. Scherr agreed.

#### **Commission Action**

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – elevations; Exhibit B – site plan; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:



1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits C and D.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct 10' X 10' garden shed per attached plans. Shed will have German siding and asphalt shingle roof to match house with wood, one over one window on west side. Door will be wood. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, garages and Outbuildings found on pages 52-53, in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The structure will be located in the rear yard and be compatible with the main structure.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Williams  
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**  
**The shed door will be on the south elevation and the window will be on the west elevation.**

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Duermit  
Vote for: All

Commissioner Duermit left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

### Preliminary Review:

#### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Chris Ortwen
<b>Subject Property:</b>	135 Montford Ave.
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	June 13, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford

**PIN:** 9649.13-13-5124  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted her concern that the proposed roof structure is not traditional and said that a carriage house should be compatible with the main house, but should be simplified.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Tim Fierle, project architect, explained that the tower allows the addition of a stairway and a half story. He explained that the garage was built sometime in the early seventies and that it encroaches into the required setback. He said that the tower element would help block the view of some of the inappropriate alterations on the rear of the main house.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

**Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Riviere pointed out that a tower would not be in character with a carriage house, that it wouldn't read as a carriage house if a monumental structure was added and said that he didn't see any way the Commission could approve it. They discussed the challenges of required building setbacks and separation and some possible solutions. Then it was decided that since the garage is a non-contributing structure it could either be attached to the house or demolished and replaced with another accessory structure or an addition to the rear of the main house. Mr. Fierle said he would work on another plan and come back to the Commission for another preliminary review.

**Commission Action**

None

**Other Business:**

a. Update on preliminary applications for local landmark status 32, 34 & 46 Haywood Street and 1 Battery Park Avenue

Ms. Merten reported that the applications have been withdrawn

b. Discuss preliminary applications for landmark status for the Jackson, Westall, Commerce and Legal buildings

Several Commissioners said they would like to visit the buildings. It was decided that a special meeting would be announced so that as many Commissioners who were interested could attend.

Ms. Merten announced an all day training session for Commissioners to be held on Thursday, July 12 and strongly encouraged everyone to attend. She said time and location details would be forthcoming.

Chair Winer adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.